Calculation of quantum discord in arbitrary dimensions, especially for X- and other specialized states

A. R. P. Rau*
Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA
(Dated: January 24, 2017)

Quantum discord, a kind of quantum correlation based on entropic measures, is defined as the difference between quantum mutual information and classical correlation in a bipartite system. Procedures are available for analytical calculation of discord when at least one of the parties is a qubit with dimension two. We extend now to systems when both parties are of larger dimension, of interest to qudit-quDit with $d, D \geq 3$ or spin chains of spins ≥ 1. Unitary operations involved are reduced to the most compact form so as to minimize the number of variables needed for extremizing the classical correlation that is the most difficult part of the discord calculation. Results are boiled down to a simple recipe for the extremization that for some classes of density matrices even gives trivially the final value without that extremization. A qutrit-qutrit ($d = 3$) system is discussed in detail with specific applications to density matrices for whom results are available for an unrelated but simpler-to-evaluate correlation termed geometric discord and for whom the entropic discord has involved difficult numerics. Special attention is given to the so-called X-states and Werner and pseudo-pure states when the calculations become particularly simple. Systematics for X-states of arbitrary dimension are discussed in an appendix.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta,03.67.-a

arXiv:1701.05922v1 [quant-ph] 20 Jan 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum correlations other than entanglement [1] have increasingly been discussed in quantum information. Among them, quantum discord has attracted attention and is calculated in terms of von Neumann entropies of density matrices [2]. Thereby, its definition and calculation is in principle available for bipartite systems AB of arbitrary dimension whereas entanglement measures such as concurrence or negativity have not been established beyond qubit-qubit and qubit-qutrit (dimension three) systems [3]. On the other hand, the tricky part of computing discord lies in considering all possible projective measurements on one of the parties to get a conditional entropy of the other, thereby accounting for all classical correlations between the parties. Quantum discord is then defined as the residual correlation left behind once the maximum classical correlation has been subtracted from the total.

A convenient procedure for describing and computing such measurements in terms of parametrization of unitary transformations of a qubit has been given [4, 5] and reduced to a very simple prescription applicable to qubit-qudit or N-qubit systems [6]. The largest number of variables over which the classical correlation has to be maximized is two, although simplifications often reduce the work involved even further. We extend now these prescriptions to cases when both parties are of dimension larger than that of a qubit. In particular, for a qutrit or spin 1 with dimension three, the largest number of variables needed is four or six, and even fewer for classes of density matrices of most interest. We discuss X-states [7, 8] as well as Bell, Werner, and many other states that are often discussed in a variety of situations. An appendix also provides a systematic definition of such X-states, their symmetry and number, in any dimension.

The arrangement of this paper is as follows. Section II reviews the procedure for calculating discord when a qubit is involved [6]. This presentation is focussed on one of our primary concerns, to reduce to a minimum the number of parameters that need to be varied for maximizing the classical correlation, so as to point to the same for higher dimensions. Many-parameter variation can be tedious so that reducing the number of them is very important. Section III presents such a procedure and illustrates with the example of a qutrit of dimension 3. Section IV applies the method to compute quantum discord for some qutrit-qutrit density matrices, of both pure and mixed states, of interest. An alternative geometric discord has been presented for some of these [9] and we use that and other work for comparison. We discuss especially X-states where, for arbitrary dimension, the form of the density matrix is preserved making calculations simpler; at the same time, these states encompass much physics of interest. The appendix presents a group symmetry of these states that makes transparent their generation and properties, again connecting to and generalizing what is available for qubits [6, 8, 10].

II. PROCEDURE FOR A QUBIT

A bipartite system AB with A a qubit and B of possibly larger dimension such as four with a density matrix

$$\rho = \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} \rho_{11} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{14} & \rho_{15} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{18} \\ 0 & \rho_{22} & \rho_{23} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{26} & \rho_{27} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{32} & \rho_{33} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{36} & \rho_{37} & 0 \\ \rho_{41} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{44} & \rho_{45} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{48} \\ \hline \rho_{51} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{54} & \rho_{55} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{58} \\ 0 & \rho_{62} & \rho_{63} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{66} & \rho_{67} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{72} & \rho_{73} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{76} & \rho_{77} & 0 \\ \rho_{81} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{84} & \rho_{85} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{88} \end{array}\right) \tag{1}$$

serves to illustrate our previous results [5, 6]. Such a so-called "extended-X" state [6] can be viewed as four equally-sized blocks, such a 2×2 block structure reflecting sub-system A; within each block, the 4×4 denotes the dimension of sub-system B, these blocks having the structure of the letter X with non-zero entries only along the diagonal and anti-diagonal [7, 8].

In calculating quantum discord, the quantum mutual information in the full system AB, defined as [2, 4]

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho^{AB}) = S(\rho^A) + S(\rho^B) - S(\rho^{AB})\,, \tag{2}$$

where $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho\,\log_2\rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy, is easily computed, even analytically. Note that in doing so, for the eigenvalues required for these entropies, the 1-4-5-8 and 2-3-6-7 subspaces of Eq. (1) are decoupled, simplifying the algebra involved.

The second part of calculating discord is the computing of classical correlation between A and B by accounting for all possible projective measurements over A. The essential idea [4] is to use von Neumann projections, as transformed by arbitrary unitary transformations, to describe all possible measurements on qubit A. Starting with two orthogonal projectors, $\Pi_i = |i\rangle\langle i|$, $i = \pm z$ for sub-system A, and unitary operators $U \in SU(2)$, a general measurement for A can be written as [4]

$$A_i = U\,\Pi_i\,U^\dagger. \tag{3}$$

U may be parametrized in terms of Pauli spin matrices of A as [4]

$$U = t\,I + \mathrm{i}\,\vec{y}\cdot\vec{\sigma}\,, \tag{4}$$

with $t, y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2 = 1$. Only three of these parameters are independent, assuming values $t, y_i \in [-1, 1]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

The conditional density operator ρ_i associated with a measurement of sub-system A is [4]

$$\rho_i = \frac{1}{p_i}(A_i \otimes I)\rho(A_i \otimes I)\,, \tag{5}$$

where the probability p_i equals $\mathrm{tr}[(A_i \otimes I)\rho(A_i \otimes I)]$. Because of the projection operators in it, we have $A_i^2 = A_i, \sum_i A_i = I$, and with the choice of measurement directions $i = \pm z$, we get the identity,

$$A_i(\sigma\cdot\vec{V})A_i = \pm(\vec{z}\cdot\vec{V})A_i, \tag{6}$$

which greatly simplifies the seemingly complicated calculation in Eq. (5). Here, $\vec{z}$ is a unit vector formed out of the four parameters in Eq. (4) as given in [4]

$$\vec{z} = \{2(-ty_2 + y_1y_3), 2(ty_1 + y_2y_3), t^2 + y_3^2 - y_1^2 - y_2^2\}, \tag{7}$$

and we have

$$A_\pm = U\Pi_{\pm z}U^\dagger = (I \pm \vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{z})/2. \tag{8}$$

The above procedure, first given in [4], already contains a subtlety at this point to which we will return in Sec. III, namely, a reduction from the three parameters in Eq. (4) to just the two of the unit vector $\vec{z}$ in Eq. (7). An alternative standard parametrization of the unit vector in polar angles, the usual 'Bloch angles' [1], gives the 2×2 matrix in Eq. (8) as

$$A_+ = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \cos^2(\theta/2) & \frac{1}{2}\sin\theta\exp(-i\phi) \\ \frac{1}{2}\sin\theta\exp(i\phi) & \sin^2(\theta/2) \end{array}\right), \tag{9}$$

and A_- its parity conjugate with (θ, ϕ) replaced by $(\pi - \theta, \pi + \phi)$, that is, with diagonal entries interchanged and a change in sign of the off-diagonal entries.

The conditional density matrix [4] for sub-system B because of measurements on A is given by

$$S(\rho|\{A_i\}) = \sum_i p_i\,S(\rho_i)\,, \tag{10}$$

and its quantum mutual information, a measure of total correlation [11], by

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho|\{A_i\}) = S(\rho^B) - S(\rho|\{A_i\})\,. \tag{11}$$

A measure of the resulting classical correlations then follows [2, 4] as

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho) = \sup_{\{A_i\}}\,\mathcal{I}(\rho|\{A_i\})\,. \tag{12}$$

Finally, the quantum discord is obtained as the difference between Eq. (2) and Eq. (12),

$$\mathcal{Q}(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(\rho) - \mathcal{C}(\rho)\,. \tag{13}$$

As we have shown before [6], the entire calculation can be condensed into the form of a recipe or a simple prescription for any such system AB with A a qubit, that all elements of each $\{jk\}$-block of the four blocks of Eq. (1) are multiplied by the kj-th element of Eq. (9) and the

four blocks added together to get $p_i\rho_i$ in Eq. (5) after which eigenvalues and entropies in Eq. (10) and Eq. (11) are easily calculated. The supremum in Eq. (12) requires varying the two angle parameters in Eq. (9). Because of the parity symmetry that has been noted [5], the expression is always an even function of $\cos\theta$. Further, because of the way ϕ occurs in Eq. (9), for many density matrices, this parameter disappears from the eigenvalue calculation and the extremization reduces to just one variable θ. Even further, although our original conclusion [5] that the extremum is reached at the value of $\theta = \pi/2$ is only true when the function has only one extremum and an actual computation is necessary in general, that conclusion seems to hold for all but a tiny fraction of density matrices [6, 12, 13], thereby making the calculation even simpler in most instances.

We also note that when it is B that is the qubit and A of possibly any dimension, the equivalent recipe for discord calculation with measurements over the qubit end is to take each of the 2×2 blocks in the qudit-qubit ρ, multiply the jk-th element by the kj-th element of A_i in Eq. (9) and add all four to give the $d \times d$ conditional density matrix. This same prescription applies to the more general considerations in Sec. III, blocks added together when measurements made on the left A end but all within a block added when the measured end is B on the right. Of course, for symmetric systems such as those considered in Sec. IV, the entropic discord either way is the same.

III. DISCORD CALCULATION FOR SPIN LARGER THAN 1/2

The above procedure when A is a qubit is, in principle, easily extended to when it (and B) is of larger dimension, say $d_A \geq 3$. The density matrix of AB would, as in Eq. (1), be viewed in terms of $d_A \times d_A$ blocks, each block a matrix of $d_B \times d_B$. With d_A projectors Π_i in Eq. (3), a natural parametrization of the unitary matrix in that equation would involve $(d_A^2 - 1)$ independent operators and coefficients in Eq. (4). Thus, for A a spin-1 or qutrit with $d_A = 3$, eight Gell-Mann matrices λ_i [14] would occur instead of the Pauli matrices. Two of them are diagonal and also would stand in the projectors:

$$\Pi_{1,2} = (2I \pm 3\lambda_3 + \sqrt{3}\lambda_8)/6,\ \Pi_3 = (I - \sqrt{3}\lambda_8)/3. \quad (14)$$

A calculation analogous to that in Sec. I would give d_A matrices A as in Eq. (8) and Eq. (9). Multiplying their kj-th element into the jk-th block of ρ_{AB}, and adding the blocks would give the $d_B \times d_B$ conditional density matrix from which eigenvalues and classical correlation are computed.

However, an immediate question arises, namely, what is the number of independent parameters needed for the extremization? We saw in the previous section that for a qubit it is at most two, not the expected 3 of SU(2) unitary matrices. Understanding this reduction provides the clue to the generalization to the higher SU(d_A). For this purpose, the casting of a unitary U as a product U_1U_2 with the first term describing a "base manifold" and the second a "fiber" is useful [15]. For SU(2), this latter is a pure phase and is the exponential of σ_z. Since it commutes with the projectors in Eq. (8) that also involve σ_z only, it disappears at this stage of the calculation, leaving the A matrices in that equation dependent only on U_1 and, therefore, on that base manifold's two dimensions only. It is conveniently regarded [16] as a complex number z or through an inverse stereographic projection as the unit vector of the Bloch sphere or its polar angles as in Eq. (9). (There is here an interesting parallel between the complex number z and the unit vector $\vec{z}$ of Eq. (7).) This picture of unitary operations in terms of a base manifold and a fiber, the latter not occurring in the extremization and the former simply related to the Bloch sphere, gives a ready explanation for the reduction to two variational parameters and a natural geometrical casting of them. It is the key to our simplification compared to other results on qutrit systems in the recent literature [17–19]. Therefore, we will now extend this argument to qutrits and higher-dimensional systems.

In repeating the calculation of classical correlation and thereby quantum discord, we use for concreteness the value $d_A = 3$ of a qutrit to illustrate the procedure that, however, applies more generally. For the 3×3 case, the question is how many parameters will be involved in the extremization in analogy to the previous section's reduction to two from three. That it will again not take the full eight of SU(3) symmetry as may be expected at first sight can be seen as follows. In establishing results analogous to Eq. (6) and Eq. (8), we use a similar decomposition of U as U_1U_2 that has been provided in [16]. Although U_1 in Eq.(28) of that paper is a linear combination of all eight λ, it depends only on four parameters, viewed either as two complex numbers (z_1, z_2) or four real angles $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$. The second unitary matrix U_2 is block-diagonal with an upper 2×2 SU(2) block and a lower 1×1 single entry. It is clearly a linear combination of just four of the Gell-Mann matrices $(\lambda_{1-3}, \lambda_8)$. Therefore, in the analog to Eq. (8), although the full U_2 no longer commutes through to disappear in a product expression, there is nevertheless considerable simplification.

For this purpose, the structure of Π_i in Eq. (3) is crucial, that they are matrices with only one non-zero entry, namely unity in the i-th diagonal position, $i = 1, 2, \ldots d_A$. The U in Eq. (3) is viewed as U_1U_2 as in [15, 16], with two unitary factors, the latter block-diagonal in terms of lower dimensional U. Thus, the only parameters needed are the z of [15, 16] involved at each step in such a construction of U. These sets of complex numbers z, or their alternative rendering in terms of pairs of polar angles, are the parameters varied to extremize the classical correlation. For A a qutrit, U_1 is given in Eq.(27) and Eq.(28) of [16]. U_2 has an upper diagonal

block of a qubit and a pure phase as its lower diagonal block. As a result, for A_3 in Eq. (3), with Π_3 having only one non-zero entry of unity in the lowest diagonal position, U_2 drops out to leave behind $U_1\Pi_3 U_1^\dagger$ which further becomes

$$A_3=\begin{pmatrix} s_1^2c_2^2 & s_1^2s_2c_2e^{i(\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2)} & -s_1c_1c_2e^{i\epsilon_1} \\ s_1^2s_2c_2e^{-i(\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2)} & s_1^2s_2^2 & -s_1c_1s_2e^{i\epsilon_2} \\ -s_1c_1c_2e^{-i\epsilon_1} & -s_1c_1s_2e^{-i\epsilon_2} & c_1^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

where we we have abbreviated $c=\cos\theta, s=\sin\theta$ and similarly for subscripts 1 and 2.

Thus, A_3 involves only four parameters, those of the two complex z of the SU(3) base manifold in Eq.(27) and Eq.(28) of [16]. A_1 and A_2 are a little more complicated expressions than Eq. (15), involving both the two complex z of the SU(3) U_1 but also the two parameters in Eq. (8) of their SU(2) complex z in U_2. They are evaluated by sandwiching between U_1 and $U_1^\dagger$ the 3×3 block-diagonal matrix that has in its upper diagonal block $A_\pm$ from Eq. (8) and unity in the last diagonal position. They depend, therefore, on 6 parameters. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(A_1)_{11} &= c^2(s_2^2+c_2^2c_1)^2+s^2c_2^2s_2^2(1-c_1)^2 \\
&\quad -2csc_2s_2(1-c_1)(s_2^2+c_2^2c_1)\cos(\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2+\phi), \\
(A_1)_{12} &= cs[(s_2^2+c_2^2c_1)(c_2^2+s_2^2c_1)e^{-i\phi}+s_2^2c_2^2(1-c_1)^2 \\
&\quad \times e^{i(2\epsilon_1-2\epsilon_2+\phi)}]-fe^{i(\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2)}, \\
(A_1)_{13} &= css_1s_2[(s_2^2+c_2^2c_1)e^{i(\epsilon_2-\phi)}-c_2^2(1-c_1)e^{i(2\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2+\phi)}] \\
&\quad +[c^2(s_2^2+c_2^2c_1)-s^2s_2^2(1-c_1)]s_1c_2e^{i\epsilon_1}, \\
(A_1)_{22} &= c^2s_2^2c_2^2(1-c_1)^2+s^2(c_2^2+s_2^2c_1)^2 \\
&\quad -2css_2c_2(c_2^2+s_2^2c_1)(1-c_1)\cos(\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2+\phi), \\
(A_1)_{23} &= css_1c_2[(c_2^2+s_2^2c_1)e^{i(\epsilon_1+\phi)}-s_2^2(1-c_1) \\
&\quad \times e^{-i(\epsilon_1-2\epsilon_2+\phi)}]-ge^{i\epsilon_2}, \\
(A_1)_{33} &= c^2s_1^2c_2^2+s^2s_1^2s_2^2+2css_1^2s_2c_2\cos(\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2+\phi),
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

with A_2 a similar expression in which c^2 and s^2 are interchanged and the sign of cs is changed. We have defined for convenience: $f=[c^2(s_2^2+c_2^2c_1)+s^2(c_2^2+s_2^2c_1)]c_2s_2(1-c_1)]$ and $g=[c^2c_2^2(1-c_1)-s^2(c_2^2+s_2^2c_1)]s_1s_2$. All three matrices A_i are Hermitian and unitary with unit trace and we have $A_1+A_2+A_3=I$. These properties, together with the feature noted after Eq. (5) that $A_i^2=A_i$, will prove crucial in applications in Sec. IV.

The calculation of quantum discord for a qutrit system therefore requires at most the 4 or 6 parameters, angles θ and phases (ϵ,ϕ) in Eq. (15) and Eq. (16), not the original 8 of the qutrit's su(3) algebra. Further, we will see in Section IV that for many density matrices, not even all of this smaller set are needed (just as for qubits, often one parameter extremization suffices [6]); in particular, most of the phase parameters drop out in computing eigenvalues leaving primarily the θ parameters in the extremization to get the classical correlation and, thereby, the quantum discord. This cuts the number of parameters by half.

Extension to dimensions larger than a qutrit proceeds similarly. For A a qudit with $d_A=4$, the density matrix ρ_{AB} is viewed as a 4×4 block matrix, each block of $d_B\times d_B$. In constructing A_i, the 4×4 matrix U_1 may be decomposed into blocks either as 4=2+2 or 4=3+1. According to the procedure in [15], the former will involve a 2×2 matrix of 4 complex numbers z. U_2 then has two diagonal blocks of 2×2 matrices, each with its complex number z for a total of 6 complex z or 12 real parameters in all in A_i. The alternative reduction of 4=3+1, followed by 3=2+1, will mean again 3+2+1 or 6 complex z. The case of general d_A proceeds similarly, involving the sequence of triangular numbers for the number of complex z needed, that is, $d_A(d_A-1)$ real parameters in all. Instead of the canonical representation in terms of Gell-Mann matrices or their higher-dimensional counterparts, the view of [15, 16] through a sequence of z provides a reduction in the number of parameters needed for extremization and is, therefore, the preferred route to calculating quantum discord or in possible other applications. This is where we differ from previous attempts at discord calculations for qutrit-qutrit that also handled through Gell-Mann matrices [17–19].

IV. APPLICATIONS TO QUTRIT-QUTRIT SYSTEMS

To illustrate the general procedure of Sec. III, we consider some density matrices of qutrit-qutrit systems that have been recently studied in different contexts and for whom the geometric discord, a correlation simpler to evaluate, have been computed [9] as well as entropic discord [20] and other correlations [17–19].

A. Bell states

Labelling as usual the three states as 0, 1, and 2, we begin with the maximally entangled Bell state, a pure state described by $(|00\rangle+|11\rangle+|22\rangle)/\sqrt{3}$ and density matrix of the form

$$\rho=\left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} \rho_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{15} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{19} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \rho_{51} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{55} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{59} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \rho_{91} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{95} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{99} \end{array}\right), \tag{17}$$

all non-zero entries equal to 1/3 for the Bell state. By inspection, eight of the eigenvalues are zero and one unity

so that the last term in Eq. (2) is zero. Tracing over A or B in Eq. (17) gives 3×3 density matrices $I/3$ with corresponding entropies in Eq. (2) of $\log 3$. Conventionally in quantum information, logarithms have been evaluated in base 2 but it seems to fit better for our discussion of qutrits to use base 3 (more generally, base d) so that the total mutual information in Eq. (2) equals 2. This also fits what follows in the next paragraph for the classical correlation.

The procedure of Sec. III for evaluating the reduced density matrix and its entropy becomes trivial. With all blocks in Eq. (17) having one non-zero entry of 1/3, the prescription of multiplying by Eq. (15) or Eq. (16) and adding blocks gives back those same A_i matrices, multiplied by 1/3. Given that these matrices are Hermitian and unitary, the eigenvalues are 0, 0, and 1 so that the entropy in Eq. (10) of these reduced 3×3 matrices is zero. Hence, no supremization is necessary and, from Eq. (11) and Eq. (12), the classical correlation equals $\log 3 = 1$, again using base 3. So, just as with Bell states of qubit-qubit, we can conclude that all such maximally entangled Bell states of qutrit-qutrit, or any qudit-qudit, have $\mathcal{I} = 2$, equally divided into classical correlation and quantum discord of $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Q} = 1$.

B. Werner and pseudo-pure states

The Bell states of the previous sub-section are pure states. A class of mixed states obtained by mixing them with a completely mixed state that is essentially the unit matrix, I/d, with equal diagonal elements and all off-diagonal coherence terms zero ("white noise"), has been much studied both for qubit-qubit and higher dimensions. Terminology (and notation) has varied in referring to them as Werner states [9, 17–19] or making a slight distinction between them and so-called "pseudo-pure (PP)" states [20] but, in essence, they are given by the density matrix,

$$\rho_{AB} = [(1-p)/d^2]I + p|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, \tag{18}$$

with $0 \leq p \leq 1$ and $|\Psi\rangle$ the Bell state as in Eq. (17) with all non-zero entries equal to $1/d$.

The evaluation of quantum discord is straightforward. For a qudit-qudit state in Eq. (18), by inspection, one eigenvalue is $p + (1-p)/d^2$ and the remaining $d^2 - 1$ are $(1-p)/d^2$, and S_{AB} in Eq. (2) follows immediately. Tracing over either one of the qudits clearly gives a completely mixed state, I/d, so that $S_A = S_B = \log d$ in Eq. (2). Next, the calculation of the conditional density matrix in Eq. (5) is equally straightforward. Given the linearity of that expression, each term in Eq. (18) can be treated separately. The first, proportional to the unit operator, commutes through the two A_i and, with the square being A_i with unit trace, is proportional to a d-dimensional unit matrix. And, as noted in Sec. IV A, in our procedure for a Bell state, the second term also gives a reduced $d \times d$ density matrix that is A_i to a multiplicative factor. With our observation in Sec. III that the eigenvalues of A_i are all zero except one which equals unity, the eigenvalues of the conditional density matrix thereby reduce to $d-1$ of magnitude $(1-p)/d$ and one with $[p + (1-p)/d$. The results of Eq. (11) and Eq. (12) are then immediate, making unnecessary any supremum calculation because all the parameters in A_i have dropped out. This seems to have escaped notice in [9, 18, 19], the "quite difficult" supremization carried out although the final results reduce to zero values for all angles involved, in itself a pointer to the parameters introduced by A_i, or other SU(3) counterparts in their calculations, dropping out of the claculation.

The classical correlation in Eq. (12) and quantum discord in Eq. (13) are easy algebraic expressions evaluated from these eigenvalues,

$$\mathcal{C} = [(d–1)(1–p)/d]\log(1–p) + [p+(1–p)/d]\log(dp+1–p), \tag{19}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Q} = [(d-1)(1-p)/d^2]\log(1-p) + [(d^2p+1-p)/d^2] \times \log(d^2p+1–p) – [(dp+1-p)/d]\log(dp+1–p). \tag{20}$$

These results valid for all d coincide for $d = 3$ with the expressions given as Eqs.(8) and (9) in [18] for qutrits. Since they have presented plots of these correlations as a function of p, we present instead our values (using base 3 for logarithms) in Table I.

Limiting results for these correlations are interesting. Both vanish for $d = 1$ whereas for d large, and assuming that p is neither too close to 0 or 1 so that $pd >> 1 - p$, we have $\mathcal{Q} = p \log d$ rising linearly with p, a result also in [20]. With the choice of base d for any dimension, this reduces to the mixing parameter p, independent of dimension. This might be used as another justification for using logarithms to the base d, the observation [20] of correlations growing without bound with d merely a reflection of the growth in $\log_2 d$ when the base is fixed at 2. We also note that [19] generalized the results of [18] to what are called "Werner derivatives" by introducing another parameter besides p. Again, a laborious supremization was carried out but is unnecessary as per our procedure, the final correlations simple algebraic expressions depending on the two parameters for any d. The maximization of classical correlations seems to not enter into such Werner and pseudo-pure states, correlations independent of measurements on one of the sub-systems, no doubt because of the mixing of isotropic configurations in the density matrix.

C. X-states

There is an extensive qubit literature for what are called X-states. Originally so named [7] because of

p	S_{AB}	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{I}$
0	2	0	0	0
0.1	1.97	0.008	0.022	0.03
0.2	1.89	0.034	0.072	0.106
$\frac{1}{4}$	1.84	0.053	0.106	0.159
$\frac{1}{3}$	1.74	0.094	0.169	0.263
0.4	1.64	0.135	0.226	0.361
$\frac{1}{2}$	1.47	0.21	0.324	0.534
$\frac{2}{3}$	1.11	0.377	0.509	0.886
$\frac{3}{4}$	0.903	0.485	0.612	1.097
0.9	0.441	0.735	0.824	1.36
0.95	0.25	0.85	0.90	1.75
1	0	1	1	2

TABLE I: Correlations for the qutrit Werner state in Eq. (18) as a function of the mixing parameter p. The entropies S_A and S_B equal 1, while S_{AB}, classical correlation, quantum discord, and total mutual information are shown.

the appearance of a 4×4 qubit-qubit density matrix with non-zero entries only along the diagonal and anti-diagonal resembling the letter X, their attraction lies in the fewer parameters involved in them. With trace fixed, 3 real elements along the diagonal and 2 complex ones in the off-diagonal amount to 7 parameters in all. This is less than the 15 of a general qubit-qubit density matrix and makes for easier handling. At the same time, many specialized states of interest belong to this class and many physical phenomena may be studied with them without necessarily involving more general matrices. For bipartite systems with only one a qubit, the slightly larger class of "extended X" states as in Eq. (1) also prove almost as convenient because in forming the conditional density matrix, that also ends up as an X-state. Eigenvalues are then evaluated through simple quadratic equations, calculations breaking into 2×2 sub-spaces. For qubit-qubit, extended X-states include all possible 4×4 density matrices with 15 parameters [10] of such a system. Through various local transformations, higher dimensional density matrices of a more general nature can also be brought into X-form [21, 22], lending further importance to them. A different direction of generalization [22] to what have been termed "true generalized X" (TGX) states gives states that differ from our extended X states.

It seems then natural to look at similar X-states in dealing with higher-dimensional systems. Thus, a qutrit-qutrit state with entries only along the diagonal and anti-diagonal,

$$\rho^{(X)} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} \rho_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{19} \\ 0 & \rho_{22} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{28} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{37} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{44} & 0 & \rho_{46} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{55} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{64} & 0 & \rho_{66} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \rho_{73} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{77} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{82} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{88} & 0 \\ \rho_{91} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{99} \end{array}\right) \tag{21}$$

has 16 parameters, fewer than the 80 of a completely filled 9×9 matrix. Again, this results in a great economy in handling so that these states are natural targets for studying quantum correlations and other characteristics of qudit-quDit systems. In the Appendix, we will consider a symmetry structure of these states just as has been described for qubits [8, 10] that also permits extension to multipartite systems.

For a discord calculation with such X-states, eigenvalues involved in the calculation of Eq. (2) are simple, as it is in the case of qubits, the central 55 element itself an eigenvalue and the rest as pairs of 2×2 sub-spaces. The same applies to the reduced densities upon tracing over either A or B, each a 3×3 matrix with once again the central element decoupled from the others. For the conditional density upon measurements over A, our prescription in Sec. III of multiplying each of the 9 blocks by the corresponding transposed element of A_i and adding the blocks clearly results in an X-state again. Eigenvalues again follow easily. Also, as can be seen from Eq. (15) and Eq. (16) for a qutrit, parameters in their 12 and 23 elements drop out, reducing the number required for supremization. Whereas our prescription applies quite generally to any qutrit-quDit density matrix giving a $D \times D$ conditional density, for X-states and extended X-states, there is such a reduction from 4 to 3 (ϵ_2 dropping out) for A_3 and from 6 to 5 for $A_{1,2}$. In particular, many of the phase angles drop out leaving a small subset of them plus the theta angles which are $d_A(d_A-1)/2$ in number. Mutual phases between successive sub-spaces of SU(d_A) involved in the reduction of unitary matrices, as per [15], add d_A-2 for a total of approximately $d_A(d_A+1)/2$ parameters to be varied, which is also the number of POVMs (Positive Operator Valued Measures [23]). Finally, we note also other studies with qutrits [24–26] where our prescription could be applied to simplify the numerics of the extremization involved in them.

V. APPENDIX: SYSTEMATICS OF X-STATES

For a 4×4 qubit-qubit system, X-states were introduced and named for their visual resemblance to the letter [7] but, as states using just 7 parameters out of the

15 of a general density matrix, they are characterized by their symmetry under the su(2) $\otimes$ u(1) $\otimes$ su(2) sub-algebra of the full su(4) algebra that applies to the pair of qubits, whether or not the density matrix looks like X [8]. This perspective also permits the generalization to X-states of n qubits. The recognition that for a single qubit, the 2×2 density matrix is immediately an X, and that the pair system involves two such 2×2 su(2) spaces with a phase between them, represented by the u(1), points to the same iteration when more qubits are added. Thus, for 3 qubits, where the full algbera is of su($2^3 = 8$) with $8^2 - 1 = 63$ parameters, the sub-algebra [su(2) $\otimes$ u(1) $\otimes$ su(2)] $\otimes$ [u(1)] $\otimes$ [su(2) $\otimes$ u(1) $\otimes$ su(2)], a 15-parameter sub-algebra of the full su(8) algebra gives their X-states, and so on [10]. The number for n qubits is $2^{n+1} - 1$, the iteration described algebraically as the induction $2^{n+1} - 1 = 2(2^n - 1) + 1$. This constitutes a sub-algebra of that dimension of the full su(2^n) algebra of n qubits. A connection to finite projective geometries [27, 28] is also worth noting.

A similar development for qutrits or higher dimensional systems can be seen from the structure of Eq. (21) as a three-dimensional central 3×3 block of a single qutrit's X-state (with two real and one complex or four parameters) embedded in six other dimensions around it. Thus, a qutrit-qutrit X-state has 16 parameters. As with the previous paragraph for qubits, the iteration sub-algebra of the full su(9) algebra (of 80 parameters) can be described as three copies now of the starting su$^{(X)}$(3) with u(1)s in between and at the ends for the 12+4 number of parameters. The next step similarly repeats thrice the previous with 4 additional u(1)s. For n qutrits, the number of parameters is $2(3^n - 1)$ and the inductive iteration is given by $2(3^n - 1) = 3[2(3^{n-1} - 1)] + 4$. Again, in the language of symmetry groups and algebras, these are sub-algebras of the full su(3^n) algebra of n qutrits.

Table II presents values for various classes of states of such pair systems of dimensions 2 and 3. Also shown for qubits are the number of su(2) and u(1) in the sub-algebra of X-states of n qubits. Three times the former number plus the latter is, of course, the number shown in the row for X-states. That number is also the number of points in the projective geometry PG(n, 2), whereas the number in the row above of the general state is PG($2n-1$, 2). In particular, PG(2, 2) with 7 points is the Fano Plane, the simplest projective plane, of extensive mathematical interest [29]. It is interesting that the number of X-states of qubits runs through all successive integer values n of PG(n, 2) whereas the number for general states skips even values, depending as it does on $2n - 1$. Alternatively, this can be stated in terms of skipping half-odd integer values of n, that is, that PG(2, 2), PG(4, 2), etc., are absent in the general count. There is a whiff of quantum-mechanical spin angular momentum in these sequences of numbers!

Other general enumeration of the number of parameters for arbitrary dimension follows from straightforward if slightly tedious algebra. As examples, a general qubit-qudit bipartite system has $4d^2 - 1$, X-state has $4d - 1$, and extended X-state $8d - 1$ for d even and $8d - 5$ for d odd as the number of parameters. The results for a system of n qubits follows by setting $d = 2^{n-1}$ so that there are $2^{2n} - 1$, $2^{n+1} - 1$ and $2^{n+2} - 1$ states for the general, X-, and extended X-, state, respectively. Similarly, a qutrit-qudit bipartite system has $9d^2 - 1$ for a general density matrix, $6d - 1$ for d even and $6d - 2$ for d odd in X-states, and $18d - 1$ for d even and $18d - 10$ for d odd in extended X-states. Again, setting $d = 3^{n-1}$ gives the results for n qutrits: $3^{2n} - 1$, $2(3^n - 1)$ and $2(3^{n+1} - 5)$, respectively.

number of qubits	1	2	3	4	n
general	3	15	63	255	$2^{2n} - 1$
X-states	3	7	15	31	$2^{n+1} - 1$
su(2)s	1	2	4	8	2^{n-1}
u(1)s	0	1	3	7	$2^{n-1} - 1$
extended X states	3	15	31	63	$2^{n+2} - 1$
number of qutrits	1	2	3	4	n
general	8	80	728	6560	$3^{2n} - 1$
X states	4	16	52	160	$2(3^n - 1)$
extended X states	4	44	152	476	$2(3^n - 5)$

TABLE II: Enumeration of the number of states in a general, an X-, and an extended X- state of n qubit and qutrit systems.

Even more broadly, a qudit-qudit bipartite system has $d^4 - 1$ parameters in a general ρ, $2d^2 - 1$ for d even and $2d^2 - 2$ for d odd in X-states, and $2d^3 - 1$ for d even and $2d^3 - d^2 - 1$ for d odd extended X-states. For $d = 4$, this number for X-states of n such qudits is $2(4^n) - 1$ which means through $2(4^n) - 1 = 4[2(4^{n-1}) - 1] + 3$ that each successive qu4it means an iteration of 4 copies of the previous with u(1)s in between the copies, paralleling the iteration for n qubits. Again, these have the symmetry of a sub-algebra of the large su(d^n) algebra. An asymmetric qudit-quDit system has similar enumerations. There are in general $d^2D^2 - 1$ parameters, X-states having the smaller number $2dD - 1$ for dD even and $2dD - 2$ for dD odd.

It is also interesting to note as a complement to the above paragraphs that for pure states, the density matrices have fewer parameters. With the eigenkets themselves available, a normalization and an overall phase dropping out, there are $d^n - 1$ complex elements or twice that number of real parameters defining such a density matrix. This number is very similar to the number for corresponding X-states noted above. Finally, so-called quantum-classical density matrices are of interest in some discussions of correlations. With A described in terms of quantum ket-bra and B a classical density matrix, they have the form

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{d} p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \rho_i^{(B)}, \tag{22}$$

with p_i probabilities ($0 \le p_i \le 1$), and $\rho^{(B)}$ classical density matrices of sub-system B. As noted for pure states, these are $2(d-1)$ in number, there are $d-1$ probabilities, and each classical density matrix has D^2-1 parameters for a total of $d(D^2+d-1)-1$ parameters, again smaller than the full d^2D^2-1 in a general ρ. Also, again the number is asymmetric in d and D.

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).

[2] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys.Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002); L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2002).

[3] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).

[4] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).

[5] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010); **82**, 069902(E) (2010).

[6] Sai Vinjanampathy and A. R. P. Rau, J. Phys. A **45**, 095303 (2012); A. R. P. Rau, Pramana **83**, 231 (2014).

[7] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 140404 (2004); Quantum Inform. Comput. **7**, 459 (2007).

[8] A. R. P. Rau, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 412002 (2009).

[9] L. Jakobczyk, A. Fyrdryszak, and P. Lugiewicz, arXiv:1511.06097.

[10] Sai Vinjanampathy and A. R. P. Rau, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 032336 (2010).

[11] N. Li and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 032327 (2007).

[12] X. M. Lu, J. Ma, Z. Xi, and X. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012327 (2011); Q. Chen, C. Zhang, S. Yu, X. X. Yi, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A 84, 042313 (2011); N. Quesada, A. Al-Qasimi, and D. F. V. James, J. Mod. Opt. **59**, 1322 (2012).

[13] Y.Huang, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 014302 (2013).

[14] H. Georgi, *Lie Algebras in Particle Physics* (Perseus Books, Reading, 1999), Sec. 7.1; W. Greiner and B. Müller, *Quantum Mechanics: Symmetries* (Springer, Berlin, 1994), Sec. 7.2.

[15] D. Uskov and A. R. P. Rau, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 022331 (2008).

[16] Sai Vinjanampathy and A. R. P. Rau, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 425303 (2009).

[17] B. Liu, Z. Hu, X-W. Hou, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **12**, 1450027 (2014).

[18] B. Ye, Y. Liu, J. Chen, X. Liu, and Z. Zhang, Quantum Inf. Process. **12**, 2355 (2013).

[19] G. Li, Y. Liu, H. Tang, X. Yu, and Z. Zhang, Quantum Inf. Process. **14**, 559 (2015).

[20] E. Chitambar, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 032110 (2012).

[21] C. Zhou, T-G. Zhang, S-M. Fei, N. Jing, and X. Li-Jost, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 010303 (2012).

[22] S. R. Hedemann, arXiv:1310.7038; 1611.03882.

[23] S. Hamieh, R. Kobes, and H. Zaraket, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 052325 (2004); P. Shor, arXiv:quant-ph/0009077.

[24] M. Ali, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042303 (2010).

[25] R. Rossignoli, J. M. Matera, and N. Canosa, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 022104 (2012).

[26] A. S. M. Hassan, B. Lari, and P. S. Joag, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024302 (2012).

[27] D. Raghava Rao, *Constructions and combinatorial problems in design of experiments* (John Wiley, New York, 1971); R. C. Bose and B. Manvel, *Introduction to combinatorial theory* (John Wiley, New York, 1984).

[28] A. R. P. Rau, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042323 (2009); J. Biosci. **34**(3), 353 (2009).

[29] T. Beth, D. Jungnickel, and H. Lenz, *Design Theory* (Bibl. Inst., Zürich, 1985), and *Encyclopaedia of mathematics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993).